UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,261	08/01/2003	Kent Charles Burr	129640-1	5497
	7590 02/13/200 ECTRIC COMPANY	EXAMINER		
GLOBAL RESEARCH PATENT DOCKET RM. BLDG. K1-4A59			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
NISKAYUNA,		4A39	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/13/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ldocket@crd.ge.com rosssr@crd.ge.com parkskl@crd.ge.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/632,261	BURR, KENT CHARLES		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Mathieu D. Vargot	1791		

	Matnieu D. Vargot	1/91	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>26 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavir eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (i MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). `		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origing the contract of the contrac	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	e appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	•		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying th	he issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.116	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		Inpliant Amendment (F 1 OL-324).
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
non-allowable claim(s).			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	verco <mark>me <u>all</u> rejections under appea</mark>	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Mathieu D. Vargot/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1791	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: as stated in the Final rejection, one of ordinary skill in this art would realize and understand the different ways a laser would be used to impart boundary or border structures within an optical body. While the primary reference may remove portions completely, the secondary references teach not removal, but an altering of the material so that the properties at the desired points are changed. This would allow the instant guiding of the x-rays to thereby afford the instant sharing, rather than setting up definite reflective boundaries. While applicant insists that the primary reference is making a decoder, that would not function if sharing were to occur, such is not persuasive. Corbeil et al also discloses that the product made would be a light guide, one that allows the internal manipulation of light waves and higher efficiency in the control and collection of scintillation light. As the primary reference is directed to controlling and collecting light, the formation of a scintillator waveguide that would allow optical sharing is not beyond the scope of the disclosure therein. While light is known to have wave and particle properties, it is not understood exactly what is meant by "ray" properties or how this differs form wave properties. At any rate, it is believed that a prime facie case of obviousness has been established based on the record at this point.